DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 991 UD 017 878

TITLE	Final Report on the Collaborative Research Project; New York Urban Coalition - I.S. 162, Community School District #7.
INSTITUTION	New York Urban Coalition, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. School Capacity for Problem Solving Group.
PUB DATE	Oct 77
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Junior High Schools; Parent Role; *Problem Solving; *Research Projects; School Community Relationship; *School Organization; Site Analysis; Student Role; Teacher Role; *Technical Assistance; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New York (Bronx)

ABSTRACT

This project was the result of a three year collaboration between the New York Urban Coalition and Intermediate School 162, Bronx, New York. Concerns addressed included institutional development, collaborative planning and implementation, school form and process, and technical assistance strategies. Intermediate School 162 was selected for development as a mini-school complex. The theory was that any real changes in education had to take place on a local school level. Relationships between the school, teachers, parents, and the larger community were envisioned as key factors in educational change. This report reviews the major components of the project and discusses the "learnings" which emerged. (Author/GC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148991

UD

FINAL REPORT ON THE COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT

NEW YORK URBAN COALITION - I.S. 162, COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #7

Submitted to
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
SCHOOLS CAPACITY FOR PROBLEM SOLVING UNIT
DR. RENE GONZALEZ
PROJECT OFFICER

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted by
LYNN H. GRAY
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
DIRECTOR
NEW YORK URBAN COALITION
EDUCATION PROGRAM

October 1977

UD 017878

PROLOGUE:

This is the final report on a completed research project funded by the National Institute of Education - Schools Capacity for Problem Solving Group. The project, which was a three year collaboration between the New York Urban Coalition (the grantee) and Intermediate School 162, Community School District #7, Bronx, New York, wrestled with questions of institutional development, collaborative planning and implementation, school form and process and technical assistance strategies.

This report is intended as a final document in a series, which begins with the original funded proposal. It does not attempt to recount all history or developments, but instead reviews the major components of the project with an emphasis on the learnings which emerged.

The organization of the report is as follows:

I. HISTORICAL REVIEW

II. MAJOR LEARNINGS

- -- THE SCHOOL
- -- SCHOOL IN DISTRICT; SCHOOL AND DISTRICT
- -- THE COALITION EDUCATION PROGRAM
- -- THE COLLABORATION

I. HISTORICAL REVIEW:

In 1973-1974, when the proposal was submitted to the National Institute of Education (NIE), the Coalition Education Program was deeply involved in developing support strategies for alternative schools within the New York City public school system. In this effort there were two primary concerns:

1. Development of a comprehensive alternative model for urban school organization: The Mini-School Complex;

2. Development of a technical assistance strategy which went beyond existing organization development work and more effectively dealt with the organismic, idiosyncratic nature of schools.

At the same time Intermediate School 162 was involved in a comprehensive review and assessment of its operations, organization and impact. Under the banner of "redirection", practically the entire school-community was wrestling with the primary questions related to governance, ownership and daily operation. One of the major causes for this self analysis was the fact that a major sub-component of the existing I.S. 162 organization was performing substantially better than the rest of the school; this component was a mini-school.

The Coalition and Intermediate School 162 formed a working partnership in the Spring of 1974. The partnership was designed to explore collaborative ownership of a local school development effort; it became programmatic when the NIE proposal was accepted.

The strategy, as funded by NIE, called for a collaborative implementation of the "redirected I.S. 162" as a mini-school complex. The Coalition was to provide broad technical help to the total school operation and to a variety of subsystems within that organization. The School of Education of City College, New York City, an early partner in the collaboration, exited in Phase II for complicated reasons discussed in detail in other documents.

The collaboration was effected not only because there was general concurrence about schooling goals but also because there was a perceived agreement about the basic necessary conditions for local school development - school change. In a retrospective discussion of the basic operational assumptions which governed the school's redirection, the I.S. 162 Principal set forth the following twelve propositions:

1. If real change can come about in education, it has to be made right here (at the local school). It will not come from: the federal government; the city; the state; the district. Each of these (systems) has to be supportive -- but it cannot be the chief change agent.

2. Change has to be accomplished in a partnership arrangement between district - school administration - parents - teachers - students.

3. Individuals -- teachers, parents, students -- within the change process have to be given real responsibility for decision making. Their decisions have to be carried out. This gives the participants a sense of ownership.

4. Schools are too large and impersonal. They have to be broken down to give the students a closer relationship to the institution.

5. Decisions about curriculum development and teacher training have to come from within the school.

6. A school's responsibility is not only to train administrators and teachers to participate in governance and decision making but also to train students and parents as well.

7. The school has to use the resources of the city to help in the training of administrators, teachers, parents and students.

8. The school has to develop partnerships with universities, foundations and educational institutions, such as the NYUC, who are interested in helping schools change.

9. The school must seek funds on its own, independent of funds received from the L.E.A. to support personnel and programs.

10. The school must develop the capacity to conduct its own research and do its own program development.

11. The school has to be supportive of many learning styles and teaching styles. It has to accept the proposition that there are many roads to the same ends for children. However, each of these styles must be open to critical evaluation.

12. Schools have to break down teacher and student isolation. Dan Sortie in his book "School Teacher" calls teachers Robinson Crusoes, monarchs, and prisoners of an island existence. I might add that administrators probably view themselves in the same way.

Sortie adds, "The isolated, fitful and various patterns in which teachers learn their trade and ply it makes it hard for them to think in collective terms about it. And this inability, in turn, constantly threatens their standing with the outside world of parents, school boards and critics of education."

-- Harvey Goldenberg
Speech to members of CSD #7
May 17, 1977

From the perspective of the New York Urban Coalition, the technical assistance group in this research, these propositions and their real expression in the development and implementation of the I.S. 162 setting begin to get at basic factors related to institutional development. The language systems used by the school and the TAG differ but there is significant congruence in primary assumptions.

The key developmental concept for the Coalition is the concept of "institutional myth". By "myth" the Coalition means the subjective story which the setting tells about itself in order to account for its particular existence. The story, which is the perceived and lived history of the school as interpreted by the key people of that history, enables the school to ground its vision for the future in its articulation of the past while affirming both its values and its right to continue existence and development. The myth is nurtured and protected within the institution at all costs. This protective process is undertaken by the real leadership of the setting -- regardless of its relationship to the "formal" leadership roles or structures. The Coalition calls the process of myth protection and development: The process of custodianing the myth.

Consider the following statements which were generated by the TAG in July of 1977. They represent analysis of a variety of interventions, including the I.S. 162 work represented in this

NIE grant, and focus on the conditions which seem to be the most important outcomes evidencing successful development within a school setting:

The school will have

1. Institutional consciousness of its own corporate reality. The emergence of this consciousness of organizational -- organic -- boundaries is marked by the articulation of a useable institutional myth.

2. A basic recognition of the continuous presence of the ultimate imperative goal (that goal which is always beyond reach). This recognition encourages movement within the setting because it is essentially inappropriate to stay where we are.

3. People openly professing a responsibility for education and for the educational system.

4. A basic recognition of the importance of rallying the basic constituencies (intentionalities) around a projected future. This recognition must be accompanied by a capability on the site to rally the constituencies.

This recognition further affirms that institutional power is generated by the people, interacting.

5. Individuals coming together in a constituency based group which actively and vigorously custodians the institutional myth, the school's particular vision and dream for itself.

6. A basic understanding that the myth can be worked out in a variety of programmatic alternatives, each of which can adequately affirm and express the central values of the myth.

7. A readiness to suspend disbelief. This readiness manifests itself in the willingness and ability of leadership to make decisions, to take risks. And this readiness affirms the necessity of action within an unclear broad social context.

Consistently throughout the life of the research period, the school community resorted to the retelling of its primary story in order to move into continually unclear and traumatic futures. The story, which is essentially the tale of the rebirth of the school as a viable, productive institution, roots itself in the

period of redirection and grounds that redirection is a series of events and encounters of the three previous years (1971-1974) which produced the group of people who came to be the custodians of the I.S. 162 myth and established their primary interaction patterns: leadership, role and function, pecking order, dominance, primary operational values, etc. (This story is told in several places, each having a slightly different view of the "real" importance of events -- much like the various interpretations of the synoptic gospels. Two tellings which are important are: The Mini-School Concept: Profile of One School that Dared. Joseph Levy, I.S. 162 staff member; the DTA Case Study of I.S. 162 prepared jointly by Gladys Rivera and Patrick Montesano -- to be released).

The Coalition places such major importance on the myth because it is the myth which sustains the people of the setting through the events of their collective existence. It enables them to continuously redefine their actions in the world without losing their identity. The myth becomes a "group analog" which enables the essentials of the group to be posited in the face of continuing change in the environment. Such positing is the continuation of the group, and the group's dream or vision of reality.

This is not the place to do a fuller discussion of institutional myth. That explication is a major aspect of the continuing work of the TAG. It should simply be noted here that it is a tentative conclusion of an analysis by the TAG that the trauma of

1975-1977 within the New York City school system did not disrupt the operations of the I.S. 162 school community as severely as it did neighboring school settings, though the objective facts of the trauma were roughly equivalent (that is, the same number of "excessed teachers", the same amount of resource cutback, the same duration of basic operational uncertainty at district or central headquarters). The hypothesis being used to explore this phenomena is directly related to the clarity and force of the local institutional myth. Extensive research is being undertaken in this area; results will be published at a later date.

It is now probably appropriate to close out this section of the final report with a brief historical summary.

The Coalition and Intermediate School 162 collaborated over a three year period on a variety of activities designed to extend

1. The capability of the I.S. 162 school community to serve both the students and the immediate neighborhood community

and

2. The capacity of the Coalition to act as a catalytic agent fostering development in local school settings throughout the city.

The original design of the project -- as articulated in the Phase I proposal -- was essentially carried out. That is, I.S. 162 became a viable mini-school complex, governed jointly by the Principal and a School Development Team which focused its energies primarily on the development and operation of the Resource Center. The programmatic activities within the subschools developed somewhat idiosyncratically, but this growth (a primary goal of the initial vision) was greatly hampered by the major disruptive events in the New York City school system. Continuous staffing changes and a general truncation of the teaching staff combined to make development within the subschools difficult. (Using the language of the TAG, another way of saying this is that with the exception of the original "fourth floor sub-school" none of the others was able to generate a viable myth base -- and had, therefore, constant difficulty rallying and maintaining powerful commitment to collective goals.)

The school did implement a sharing agenda with other interested District 7 schools -- of which there were, gratifyingly, several. The events related to this sharing centered around the primary dream of the I.S. 162 community (its myth) and focused on the learnings from the I.S. 162 operational experience which might be useful for other schools. There was thus attention paid to both the concept of local school development (e.g. the dynamics, the process, the primary goals) and to the programmatic learnings generated through the particular struggles of I.S. 162 (e.g. the parent courses, the learning center, the SDT).

Entering 1977-1978 the mini-school complex remains the central programmatic tool for the development of the I.S. 162 community and while it undergoes regular programmatic adjustment it seems to have provided essential developmental stability for the setting.

The Coalition and I.S. 162 survived, rather gracefully, their marriage and remain in active regular dialogue.

Further historicizing can be better accomplished by looking at the primary learnings which were generated by the research activities.

II. MAJOR LEARNINGS:

THE SCHOOL:

Five key learnings seem most important at this point in the development of the school. They relate to three primary foci for school operations: governance, leadership and organization.

1. The first has to do with the concept of shared ownership. Over the term of the research program the concept of collective and shared ownership of the school's basic processes, programs and primary values emerged as the school's most important core, or generating, idea. "Shared ownership" became the key metaphor used to ground the belief that a variety of individuals, groups and constituencies had a legitimate right (and responsibility) to be active partners in the development and assessment of the school community.

   "Ownership" within the I.S. 162 community implied an equal right to participate in the continued redirection of the school. It became an umbrella metaphor which protected a wide variety of activities: the formation of new governance units (e.g. the SDT), the process of curriculum analysis and development (e.g. the learning center, the resource center), the collaborative battles to protect the school from the citywide "excessing" process.

   Ownership by definition included everyone in. Yet it must be added that an important sublearning in the setting relates to the fact that not everyone got (or came) in equally: That some owned with more vigor and authority than others -- and

even that some seemed to be given more beneficial kinds of ownership. (The details of this latter kind of analysis can be explored in documents like the DTA Case Study.)

2. The second learning relates to the dream of <u>shared leadership</u>. This idea is fundamental to the I.S. 162 myth and is grounded in the school's initial exploration of the mini-school concept. Shared leadership means that a wide range of individuals and constituencies are defined into the leadership functions of the school community. It means further that the Principal actively seeks to extend participation in leadership throughout the ranks of community personnel. To do this implies that the "facilitator" aspect of the Principal's role must be emphasized.

In I.S. 162 shared leadership was in many ways a fact. Testimony to this is the SDT, the Resource Center, the Learning Center, the family units within the subschools, etc. For each of these to be a reality is also evidence that the Principal did extensive facilitation.

Yet though it was a fact, the primary learning about shared leadership relates to the process of developing it -- of allowing it to emerge: this process proved to be more difficult than was originally expected -- both because of the

principal's style (here the training work done by Management Design, Incorporated is pertinent) and because of the general difficulty to sustain commitment through difficult -- even traumatic -- events (here the gradual withdrawal of certain key initiators from the SDT is pertinent). Shared leadership does exist but its form and function is different from the stated intention of the original dream.

3. The third learning relates to the problems of constituency participation in school operations. The dream of the school in its redirection statements was to create a setting in which there was extensive involvement of the various primary constituencies in the defining of goals and objectives for school programs.

It is certainly easy to show extensive work in this area throughout the range of school programs and activities: membership on SDT, parent component of Resource Center, etc. There were (are) many joint forums for constituency participation in school development agendas.

All this notwithstanding there is also evidence on the site which underscores the difficulty in regularly achieving collaborative ownership of school processes through constituency participation. Probably the most important indication of this difficulty can be found in the SDT itself: throughout the term of research within the SDT, the teacher-staff consti-

tuency was the dominant-leading group. The parents and the students, while represented, rarely achieved real political equality -- that is, rarely participated with the same clarity, force or consistency as the teachers.

It should be noted that the phenomenon is not unique to the I.S. 162 setting but is widely observable in other settings with which the TAG has been associated. And it should also be noted that there was nothing in the formal procedures of the SDT at I.S. 162 which accounts for this imbalance in participation.

4. The fourth learning relates to the general question of school governance: In I.S. 162 it was learned that the School Development Team was a viable means to institutionalize both a regular planning process and to create a means whereby governance authority was shared by the Principal with other members of the school-community.

The SDT achieved an operational stability such that it was widely accepted as a basic element of school organization. It moved from the stage of experimental dream all the way to accepted operational norm, undergoing in the process a broadening of concept so that it became more egalitarian and constituency grounded.

Anyone who wanted to analyze the process in detail would find a study of the three designated leaders of the SDT

(from 1973-1977) enlightening: stylistically they were very different, yet each was able to take the SDT unit through a necessary stage of developmental growth and to leave the process both more solid and more effectively interwoven into the fabric of the institutional structure. (The three individuals are: John Sheridan, Delores Chavious, Jim Filomena. A fourth individual, Bruce Irushalmi, may in fact be as important to the stable development of the concept.)

5. The last major learning relates to the general area of school organization. As mentioned in the first section of this report the subschool organization has endured throughout the grant period and has been judged as viable and workable. The learning which grows out of this endurance is that the school did have the capacity to project and sustain a major organizational change -- and to do this in the face of the large disruptions visited into the school by the city's various crises.

Lots of learnings could be generated about mini-school organizations -- and about resource centers; but the key learning is that when the school community collectively defined and sought a common goal, this collective seeking seemed to generate the necessary power to sustain the setting in times of crisis. This learning, now embedded in the experience of the school (in its myth fabric), now becomes a powerful resource for continued development on the site: I.S. 162 knows

that it does have a capacity to solve its own problems (at least as long as those problems do not completely overwhelm the institution -- e.g. new waves of mass excessing.)

THE SCHOOL IN THE DISTRICT, THE SCHOOL AND THE DISTRICT:

In this final document three kinds of learnings related to the interrelationship between the local school (I.S. 162) and its district structure (Community School District #7, Bronx) will be discussed; those related to: School development; sharing; and effective impact.

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT:

One of the widely held negative assumptions about the public school system in New York City is that its structure (its various levels, political divisions, bureaucratic units) effectively blocks initiative at the local level; that in fact it undermines its own units capacity to develop. Evidence from the I.S. 162 site both corraborates and counters this assumption. For example,

1. The primary reality looked at in this research endeavor -- the redirection of I.S. 162 -- did in fact exist. And the mythic tale of its beginning and purpose is essentially valid; that is, that it was initiated and nurtured with local school vision and energy for local school development. Also operationally valid is that part of the myth which defines the district office as essentially supportive -- though not offering leadership or as much encouragement as it could.

2. On the other hand, at several crucial junctures in life of the school the larger public school system acted in such a way that the site was radically traumatized -- that its growth and development was greatly disrupted and truncated.

   The most obvious examples of this kind of destructive presence and action relate to the fiscal crisis (in the schools a problem of managerial leadership) and to the operational policies which were used to effect resource cutbacks -- here the excessing-bumping syndrome and the overly centralized budget-resource control system (in the schools a problem of both management and negotiated labor contracts). From the perspective of the TAG the fundamental flaw which is operative in this situation stems from a basic mis-analysis of the local school: Both the school bureaucracy and the unions are acting as though the systems were mechanical and not organismic -- thus parts of the "machine" are interchangeable and decisions for change can be made at "factory headquarters". The effects of the application of this mis-vision have been devastating.

The three year of research in the local I.S. 162 site would seem to affirm a developmental hypothesis something like this: local development is possible within the city system, but the key ingredient to make it happen, in addition to vision and commit-

ment, is dogged tenaciousness. The forces which unravel dreams (probably inadvertently) are at least as plentiful as those which spin and weave them. In this case for all the struggle of the past three years, I.S. 162 has only held its own: it is both stronger and weaker than it was -- the strength relates to experience and know-how; the weakness to exhaustion and personnel truncation.

SHARING:

Throughout the research an important and stressed programmatic component related to the general concept of sharing -- site to site. Dissemination, linking, networking.

Initially, sharing was discussed on the site under the broad concept of "models". That is, the work at I.S. 162 was cast as being a model for other schools to examine and perhaps follow. In this kind of developmental work the key assumption is that someplace there exists something which has the function of "model analysis" which includes at least these two basic activities:

1. Searching out and looking at models;

2. Talking out loud to an attentive audience about the search and analysis.

It is the opinion of the TAG Principal Investigator that this assumption is not grounded in the real bureaucratic world. It is further the belief of the Principal Investigator that the

reasons for the non-grounding of this assumption relate to the absence of developmental incentives within the large system: There is simply no sufficient reason, in this case, for folks to do "model analysis" or to apply model learnings. (Obviously here, the corollary assumption is that the alleged intrinsic rewards related to child support and development either do not exist or are not strong enough to generate the necessary passion for development. Again, this is not the correct forum for that exploration.)

As the grant period progressed the site focused more on sharing by engagement and involvement -- that is, the site offered real things, resources and experiences, to other sites to encourage interaction. By the end of the research period there was some evidence that this kind of sharing system would generate development in other sites. And that such development would be both organic and idiosyncratic.

Finally, it must be stated that throughout the research period the I.S. 162 school community was viewed with a certain amount of distrust by both Community School District #7 personnel and other sites in the community. The various reasons given for this perception -- I.S. 162 had too much, thought it was right, didn't listen to others, etc. -- probably got at some of the problems. But it seems clear to the Principle Investigator that the question is deeper and that it relates to both the role and function of the district office in supporting local development and to the under-

standing in local schools about the possibilities and responsibilities to pursue developmental agendas.

EFFECTIVE IMPACT:

It is hard to assess the results of the work in and at I.S. 162 in terms of its effective impact on the district or on other schools within the district.

Probably all that can be said at this point is that

1. Several large programmatic endeavors have grown out of I.S. 162 which have involved other elements of the District;

2. One or two schools are exploring key elements of the I.S. 162 process, particularly the whole role and function of the SDT.

3. General seeds have been sown in the community which suggest that school development is a necessary local activity.

4. A beginning linking structure exists at the district level which supports developmental dissemination.

THE COALITION EDUCATION PROGRAM:

During the period covered by this research grant the Coalition Education Program fundamentally altered its theory and approach to technical assistance. This particular grant played a significant role in defining the basic direction of the alterations. There are several reasons for this:

1. The Principle Investigator for this grant became the Director of the Education Program;

2. The Scope of Work of the funded research program linked old concerns of the TAG (the Mini-School Complex, the Resource Center, the planning team) with more recent strategic adjustments in technical approach (the concept of "constituency ownership", the use of a particular set of institutional development tools which allowed for the emergence of the concept of "local myth" (tools developed by MDI);

3. Problems in the collaboration not only highlighted weaknesses in the TAGs operational approach but also suggested basic policy and procedural changes which could rectify some difficulties. For example, the TAG determined that a TA approach which had only one site in a programmatic Scope of Work was essentially invalid because

    -- The work of the TAG becomes too defined by the idiosyncrasies of the site;

-- Work beyond the site with other levels of the bureaucratic structure is overly complicated by the inherent conflicts between sites and these "managerial" bureaucratic units.

-- Role for the TAG is harder to define because it becomes excessively confused with problems of "grant ownership". In this particular case the use of the research money was always an issue between the TAG and the site with the site continually defining it in a more operational, programmatic manner.

The changes in the technical assistance strategy relate primary to the following issues:

1. The understanding of the applicability of "organization development" theory of school settings;

2. The relationship of "process" and "content" in technical assistance facilitation;

3. The essential elements which must be present if the TAG is to be of value to the site.

THE APPLICABILITY OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT THEORY TO SCHOOL SETTINGS

The Coalition has moved increasingly away from a broad application of "OD" approaches to school development issues. The basic reason for this movement is that such approaches seem relevant only at certain technical-managerial points in institutional development because they lack the basic capacity to help surface and clarify the idiosyncratic core of the institution's life.

In moving away from this orientation the Coalition has still stressed the usefulness of OD techniques in certain of the more rational processes of school development: objectives clarification, strategy development, assessment processes, etc. But by confining the application of OD theory to these more restricted areas, the Coalition has reopened and greatly stressed its basic research into alternative ways to conceptualize the essential ingredients of institutional growth and development.

It is out of this exploration that our focus on institutional myth is emerging. And in this exploration we are partnering with Management Design Incorporated, a group which has been exploring human management processes for about a decade. The work of R. C. Hoover, presently at McGill University, is important in this whole exploration.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROCESS AND CONTENT IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FACILITATION:

Briefly, over the past four years the TAG has oscillated between strategies which ground process facilitation in programmatic activities (e.g., development of a mini-school complex as an occasion for establishing certain normative developmental processes in a local school) and process facilitation which consciously avoids connection to programmatic activity in the setting (e.g., facilitation of a constituency based planning team as the mechanism for organizational planning within a school without concern or involvement in the goals of that community -- that toward which planning is directed.)

At the present time our work in local schools is grounded in content. But at the same time we are working on citywide agendas related to local school development policy and operational procedures. This latter work deals almost exclusively with our theoretical conclusions and tends therefore to be more abstract and process oriented.

THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS WHICH MUST BE PRESENT IF THE TAG IS TO BE OF VALUE TO THE SITE:

The early sections of this report dealt with some of these basic questions. What needs to be said here is that there has been a gradual refinement and clarification of what goes into the relationship between TAG and client. The Coalition is increasingly clear of its TA limitations and is consequently much more focused in its preliminary negotiations with potential site partners.

One of the major learnings of the TAG through this NIE supported program of research was that its entry into the I.S. 162 community was very ill conceived and that the seeds for several of the subsequent crises in the partnership were sown in the process of unclear initial negotiation. And the negotiations were unclear because the TAG did not adequately understand its goals, its role possibilities or its organizational needs.

Two other items need to be addressed at this point:

1. How this NIE project was linked to other Coalition EP work;

2. The impact of this particular work on the other EP agendas.

LINKAGE OF NIE PROJECT AND OTHER COALITION EP WORK:

The particular piece of research being reported on here was part of a set of partnerships between the Coalition Education Program and the New York City public education system. During the three years of the grant the Coalition was actively involved with eleven other schools in four other community school districts in the city. The core activity in each of these projects revolved around the concepts of "constituency ownership" and "local development".

Within the TAG there was extensive cross site reflection and analysis. There was also a basic school development network which linked many of the user schools. I.S. 162 participated to a small

degree in this network but was not a major force.

The amount of money available to I.S. 162 was substantially greater than that of any other school partner. This affected not only the programmatic endeavors on the site -- which were much more massive -- but also the general relationship of the site to the Coalition: The TAG was in many cases perceived more as a holding company or broker than as a TA.

Finally, in all other sites a TAG facilitator was present. In this research the Principle Investigator was the EP Director and no facilitator was on site. If the TAG was at the beginning of the grant again, this would be negotiated differently: the Director cannot be the facilitator (the time demands are too high) and the absence of a facilitator tends to stress the wrong elements of the TAGs role.

THE IMPACT:

For all of the complicated reasons discussed in this document and previous ones, the TAG considers this research activity as having been extremely important to its own development. Not only were the issues dealt with on the site of major interest to the TAG but also the whole process of grant negotiation and management forced the TAG into very productive self analysis.

THE COLLABORATION:

The final section of this report should deal with the collaboration between the grantee and the school site. Not a great deal of additional material needs to be added, because much of importance to the collaboration has already been discussed.

Perhaps these few final comments will suffice.

-- All things being equal, the whole project really turned out to be collaboratively created;

-- The DTA analysis -- as evidenced by the first drafts of the case study -- will miss most of this reality; (A thing for which I think we ought to be collectively sad);

-- "Collaboration" for the TAG is now a much more political concept than it was in 1974;

-- There are several on-going discussions presently underway between the TAG, the school and the district which will probably yield some programmatic activity;

-- In basic ways we all seem a bit wiser and, delightfully, no less hopeful.